

**DOCKETED**

|                         |   |
|-------------------------|---|
| <b>Docket Number:</b>   | 25-BUSMTG-01  |
| <b>Project Title:</b>   | 2025 Business Meeting Agendas, Transcripts, and Public Comments |
| <b>TN #:</b>            | 268804  |
| <b>Document Title:</b>  | Transcript of the November 17, 2025 Business Meeting            |
| <b>Description:</b>     | N/A   |
| <b>Filer:</b>           | Kim Todd  |
| <b>Organization:</b>    | California Energy Commission                                    |
| <b>Submitter Role:</b>  | Commission Staff  |
| <b>Submission Date:</b> | 2/25/2026 11:00:52 AM   |
| <b>Docketed Date:</b>   | 2/25/2026   |

## CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

In the matter of:

Business Meeting )  
 ) Docket No. 25-BUSMTG-01  
 )

MONDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 2025

2:00 P.M. - 3:00 P.M.

In-person at:

CALIFORNIA NATURAL RESOURCES AGENCY BUILDING  
 715 P STREET  
 MEDIA ROOM (2-201) SECOND FLOOR  
 SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA 95814  
 (Wheelchair Accessible)

The California Energy Commission (CEC) aims to begin the business meeting promptly at the start time and the end time is an estimate based on the agenda proposed. The meeting may end sooner or later than the time indicated depending on various factors. Commissioners may attend remotely in accordance with Government Code section 11123.2(j).

Pursuant to the California Code of Regulations (CCR), title 20, section 1104(e), any person may make an oral comment on any agenda item. To ensure the orderly conduct of business, such comments will be limited to two minutes or less per person.

Please visit the CEC Business Meeting web page for more information and materials at  
<https://www.energy.ca.gov/proceedings/business-meetings>.

Reported by:  
 Martha Nelson

APPEARANCESCOMMISSIONERS

David Hochschild, Chair

Siva Gunda, Vice Chair

Andrew McAllister, Commissioner

Noemi Gallardo, Commissioner

Nancy Skinner, Commissioner

STAFF

Sanjay Ranchod, Chief Counsel

Ashley Gutierrez, Compliance Project Manager, Safety and  
Reliability Branch, Siting, Transmission & Environmental  
Protection Division

Wenjun Qian, Supervisor, Air Quality and Public Health Unit

Pamela Doughman, Ph.D., Energy Generation System Program  
Specialist Reliability Reserve Incentives Branch  
Reliability, Renewable Energy, and Decarbonization  
Incentives Division

Deana Carrillo, Director, Reliability, Renewable Energy &  
Decarbonization Division

PUBLIC ADVISOR'S OFFICE

Ryan Young, Deputy Public Advisor

PUBLIC COMMENT

Frank Messineo, Burbank Water and Power

Elisabeth de Jong, Southern California Public Power  
Authority

APPEARANCESPUBLIC COMMENT (cont'd)

Priscilla Quoroz, California Municipal Utilities  
Association

David Marrett

Sandy Krasner, Citizens Climate Lobby

Wesley Reutimann, SGV

Peter Eisenhardt

Ronald J. Martin, Sierra Club

Julia Dowell, Sierra Club

Carl Selkin

Leslie Purcell

| INDEX |   | <u>PAGE</u> |
|-------|---|-------------|
| 1.    | Public Comment  | 5           |
| 2.    | Magnolia Power Project (MPP) Petition to Amend<br>(01-AFC-06C) (Adjourned from November 12, 2025,<br>Business Meeting Agenda) | 9           |
| 3.    | City of Burbank (Adjourned from November 12, 2025,<br>Business Meeting Agenda)  | 16          |
| 4.    | Chief Counsel's Report  | 70          |
|       | Adjournment   | 70          |



1 matters. For public comments relating to Items 2 and 3, we  
2 will open public comment after the staff presentation on  
3 those items. We will then move to Commissioner discussion.

4 So the California Energy Commission welcomes  
5 public comment at this time. We will start with attendees  
6 in the room and move to those who are joining us virtually  
7 by phone or zoom.

8 Seeing none in the room for this general item,  
9 we're going to move to zoom. Cynthia Cannady, I'm going to  
10 unmute your line. Please state and spell your name for the  
11 record. Comments will be two minutes or less. We welcome  
12 your public comment.

13 MS. CANNADY: Good afternoon. This is Cynthia  
14 Cannady. I'm calling about the proposed expansion of the  
15 Magnolia gas plant. I am the chairperson of something  
16 called Pasadena 100. It's a coalition of 22 nonprofit,  
17 nonpartisan organizations in Pasadena. And our mission is  
18 to encourage our city and to help our city get to 100  
19 percent carbon free electric power by 2030. And  
20 fortunately, our city is committed to this goal. We have a  
21 climate emergency resolution that mandates achievement of  
22 the goal.

23 We are a city, an area that has suffered from the  
24 serious effects of climate change. More than 9,000  
25 structures were burned and devastated in our city. We know

1 what climate change is about. We're very concerned about  
2 this plan to expand a gas plant. It seems totally  
3 unnecessary. Batteries are doing very well in California  
4 now, as I'm sure you know. I don't need to say this to  
5 you. But there's really no reason to expand a gas plant.  
6 And then on top of it, to actually say in the application  
7 that you're going to have increased gas emissions during  
8 startup and that this is okay. It's very hard to  
9 understand why this would be done or why this would be even  
10 proposed.

11 We urge you not to fund this project. We need  
12 our taxpayer money in this state to be spent on projects  
13 that actually advance the transition to clean electric  
14 power and help us deal with a catastrophe that is climate  
15 change.

16 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. I want to reiterate that  
17 this period of public comments is for general matters. And  
18 for Items 2 and 3, we will call for public comment  
19 subsequently after staff presents on those items.

20 Tom Kunhardt, I'm going to unmute your line.  
21 Please identify yourself for the record, state and spell  
22 your name and your affiliation. Comments will be two  
23 minutes or less. Welcome to public comment.

24 MR. KUNHARDT: Hi, my name is Tom Kunhardt,  
25 spelled K-U-N-H-A-R-D-T. I live in Oakland, California.

1 I'm a member of the Sierra Club Energy Committee, but I'm  
2 not speaking on behalf of Sierra Club. I'm more as a  
3 concerned citizen.

4 I'm also asking the Commission to reject Item 8  
5 on the Petition to Amend --

6 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Apologies, Tom.

7 MR. KUNHARDT: Sorry?

8 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: We're going to take the public  
9 comment on those items after the staff presentation, which  
10 is the next item. So this is more for general comments.

11 MR. KUNHARDT: Oh, I'm sorry.

12 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: It's okay.

13 MR. KUNHARDT: I apologize.

14 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: You can patch back in right  
15 after we do that.

16 But just for anyone wishing to give public  
17 comment on the voting items around Magnolia and City of  
18 Burbank, wait till after the staff presentation, then we'll  
19 call for public comment.

20 Are there any other people wishing to make public  
21 comment on general items not related to these two voting  
22 items?

23 MR. YOUNG: Chair, that concludes public comment  
24 for this item.

25 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Okay. And Tom will come right

1 back to you after that item.

2           Okay, with that, we'll turn now to Item 2,  
3 Magnolia Power Project Petition to Amend, immediately  
4 followed by the presentation for Item 3, City of Burbank.  
5 These items were adjourned from the November 12th business  
6 meeting. After the staff presentations, we'll provide an  
7 opportunity for public comment on both Items 2 and 3  
8 together, and then move to commissioner discussion.

9           I welcome Ashley Gutierrez to present first.

10           MS. GUTIERREZ: Good afternoon, Chair, Vice  
11 Chair, and the Commissioners. My name is Ashley Gutierrez.  
12 I'm a Compliance Project Manager in the Safety and  
13 Reliability Division.

14           CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Is your mic on? Did you push  
15 the button?

16           MS. GUTIERREZ: It's green.

17           CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: It is? Okay, maybe -- okay.

18           MS. GUTIERREZ: Sorry, guys.

19           CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: That's okay. Thanks. Do you  
20 want me to use this one, maybe?

21           A/V REPRESENTATIVE: Check-check.

22           MS. GUTIERREZ: Mic check?

23           CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: There we go.

24           MS. GUTIERREZ: Okay.

25           CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Okay. We're off to the races.

1 MS. GUTIERREZ: Great. Good afternoon, Chair,  
2 Vice Chair, and the Commissioners. My name is Ashley  
3 Gutierrez. I'm a Compliance Project Manager in the Safety  
4 and Reliability Branch of the Siting, Transmission, and  
5 Environmental Protection Division, or STEP Division.

6 With me today from the STEP Division are Hurshbir  
7 Shahi and Wenjun Qian, supervisors for the compliance  
8 monitoring and enforcement unit, an air quality public  
9 health unit. Also here with us today are representatives  
10 from the Magnolia Power Project, Burbank Water and Power  
11 Department, and Southern California Public Power Authority.

12 We're here to present for your approval a  
13 petition that would allow an existing power facility, the  
14 Magnolia Power Project, to make efficiency upgrades to  
15 their existing combustion turbine that would increase power  
16 performance and improve summer reliability in Southern  
17 California, therefore avoiding the need to build new  
18 natural gas-powered facilities in the interim while  
19 California transitions to 100 percent renewable energy  
20 infrastructure 20 years from now in 2020 -- in 2045.

21 Lastly, these efficiency upgrades are proposed to  
22 be partially funded by the Distributed Electricity Backup  
23 Assets, or DEBA, Program as a pair of grant awards aimed to  
24 incentivize efficiency equipment upgrades at existing power  
25 facilities, which is included in business Item 3.

1           Next slide, please.

2           The Magnolia Power Project is a 323 megawatt  
3 combined cycle natural gas facility located in the City of  
4 Burbank. The project was licensed by the CEC in March 2003  
5 and began commercial operation in September 2005. The  
6 facility provides power to residents in northwestern Los  
7 Angeles County.

8           Pursuant to California Code Regulations Title 20,  
9 Section 1769, CEC staff conducted an environmental analysis  
10 of the advanced gas path and compressor advancements  
11 conformance with CEQA and applicable laws, ordinances,  
12 regulations, and standards. The CEC published the staff  
13 analysis to the Project Docket Log webpage on October 2nd  
14 for a 30-day public comment period.

15           Next slide, please.

16           The proposed efficiency upgrades included in the  
17 petition would improve grid reliability by providing up to  
18 54 megawatts of otherwise derated power during summer  
19 months when hotter temperatures reduce the efficiency and  
20 power output of gas turbines. Please note, these  
21 efficiency upgrades do not extend the life of the Magnolia  
22 Power Project facility.

23           Currently, the Magnolia Power Project generates  
24 up to 247 megawatts under summer ambient conditions. A  
25 reduction in megawatt production is a common occurrence for

1 a power facility that is 20 years old. The implementation  
2 of the efficiency upgrades would allow the facility to  
3 operate closer to its nameplate capacity of 323 megawatts.

4 The advanced gas path performance upgrade would  
5 increase the facility's power output up to 24 megawatts.  
6 The second efficiency upgrade, the advanced compressor  
7 package system, would increase the power output by up to  
8 approximately 30 megawatts. With the installation of the  
9 new advanced gas path and advanced compressor turbine  
10 components, the plant will be able to more efficiently  
11 produce power, specifically during June through October,  
12 when it is needed most.

13 Next slide, please.

14 Due to the increase in power production, the  
15 proposed modifications would result in minor increases in  
16 the NO<sub>x</sub>, CO, and VOC emissions. However, the proposed  
17 modifications would improve efficiency, which means less  
18 fuel is needed to produce the same amount of electricity.  
19 Therefore, there will be a reduction in emissions in terms  
20 of pounds of pollutants per megawatt hour produced.  
21 Ambient air quality impacts would remain less than  
22 significant as the impacts would remain below both state  
23 and national ambient air quality standards.

24 In addition, the project is required to provide  
25 reclaim trading credits and emission reduction credits to

1 offset NOx and VOC emission increases, and this requirement  
2 has already been fulfilled with the South Coast Air Quality  
3 Management District. Further, public health impacts would  
4 also remain less than significant as the health risk from  
5 the project's increased emissions would be below the Air  
6 District's health risk thresholds.

7 Staff's analysis shows that with the updated  
8 COCs, project impacts from the evaluated changes would be  
9 less than significant, including impacts to environmental  
10 justice populations. Therefore, the facility's Air  
11 District permit has been revised to reflect the inclusion  
12 of the efficiency upgrades, as well as the modification,  
13 addition, and removal of AQ permit requirements. As such,  
14 CEC staff included the Air District's permit requirements  
15 in the staff assessment to ensure consistency between the  
16 Air District's permit and the CEC's Air Quality Conditions  
17 of Certification as part of the CEC's license.

18 Next slide, please.

19 In December 2024, Southern California Public  
20 Power Authority, the owner of Magnolia Power Plant,  
21 submitted their Petition to Amend application to the CEC in  
22 tandem with their Authority to Construct application to the  
23 South Coast Air Quality Management District for the  
24 proposed efficiency upgrades.

25 In October 2025, the CEC staff assessment was

1 posted to the project docket log for a 30-day public  
2 comment period. The Air District's final determination of  
3 compliance was also released last month.

4 On November 2nd, the CEC's 30-day public comment  
5 period concluded with minor administrative comments  
6 submitted by the owner of the Magnolia Power Project,  
7 Southern Coast [sic] Public Power Authority. The minor  
8 administrative comments were addressed in the project  
9 errata, which was docketed on October 29th.

10 During the 30-day public comment period, which  
11 closed on November 2nd, 2025, only the City of Burbank  
12 filed a timely comment letter. The CEC received additional  
13 public comment during the week of November 10th, 2025.

14 Next slide, please.

15 Staff recommends approval and adoption of the  
16 order for the advanced gas path and advanced compressor  
17 efficiency upgrades and the corresponding modifications of  
18 the Air Quality Conditions of Certification in the CEC  
19 license. This includes staff's determination that the  
20 proposed modifications do not meet any of the criteria  
21 requiring subsequent or supplement environmental review.

22 This concludes my presentation. Wenjun Qian, the  
23 Supervisor for the Air Quality and Public Health Unit, will  
24 read a statement from South Coast Air Quality Management  
25 District that was submitted on Friday, November 14th.

1 Thank you.

2 DR. QIAN: Good afternoon, Chair, Vice Chair,  
3 Commissioners. My name is Wenjun Qian. I supervise the  
4 Air Quality and Public Health Unit in the Siting,  
5 Transmission, and Environmental Protection Division.

6 On November 14th, I called Shannon Lee, the  
7 Senior Air Quality Engineering Manager at the South Coast  
8 Air Quality Management District. I asked Ms. Lee to  
9 provide a brief statement summarizing South Coast AQMD's  
10 engineering evaluation of the proposed upgrades at the  
11 Magnolia Power Plant and explain how emission reduction  
12 credits work. Ms. Lee provided the following statement in  
13 a follow-up email, which has been docketed as TN-267467.

14 "South Coast AQMD has reviewed the proposed Magnolia  
15 Power Plant upgrade project and verified compliance  
16 with all applicable South Coast AQMD rules and  
17 regulations and state and federal requirements.

18 "Additionally, the facility has provided sufficient  
19 emission reduction credits, ERC, to offset emission  
20 increases for the project. ERCs are created by a  
21 modification to lower emissions or shutting down  
22 equipment in our basin. These credits can then be  
23 used by other facilities to offset their own emission  
24 increases.

25 "In addition, this project has undergone our own

1 public participation period, which included US EPA's  
2 review and approval by CEC. No comments were received  
3 from US EPA or any members of the public."

4 Now staff is available to address any comments or  
5 questions you may have.

6 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Thank you. I think we're  
7 going to do all at once and then come back; right? Yeah.  
8 Okay. Thanks.

9 Hi Pam.

10 MS. DOUGHMAN: Hi. Testing? Are we good? All  
11 right. Let's see here. Okay.

12 Good afternoon. My name is Pamela Doughman and I  
13 work with the Distributed Electricity Backup Assets  
14 Program, also known as the DEBA Program. This item is  
15 related to the Petition to Amend the Magnolia Power Project  
16 license. Today, we are presenting for your consideration  
17 two proposed grant agreements with the City of Burbank for  
18 upgrades to the Magnolia Power Project.

19 Next slide, please.

20 The DEBA Program is part of the Strategic  
21 Reliability Reserve. The development of the Strategic  
22 Reliability Reserve was established in statute to enable  
23 the state to prevent and respond to emergency energy  
24 conditions like events that occurred in 2020 and 2021. It  
25 should be noted that these types of events

1 disproportionately impact California's under-resourced  
2 populations.

3           In 2020, California experienced rotating  
4 electricity outages. In response, the governor directed  
5 the California Independent System Operator, the CPUC, and  
6 the Energy Commission to determine the root cause. Staff  
7 developed a root cause analysis that was published in  
8 January 2021.

9           As part of that process, staff identified there  
10 was no single root cause, but did confirm there were three  
11 major causal factors: one, extreme weather conditions; two,  
12 inadequate resource adequacy and planning processes; and  
13 three, market practices.

14           The three agencies were directed to take actions  
15 to identify potential additional generation supply that  
16 could help avoid future rotating outages. As part of this  
17 analysis, it was identified that the existing fossil fleet  
18 of power plants had additional capacity that could be  
19 unlocked by efficiency upgrades to improve power plant  
20 performance on hot days.

21           Later that same year, in July, the Bootleg  
22 wildfire in Oregon caused the Pacific Intertie into  
23 California to be taken offline. This resulted in a loss of  
24 about 4,000 megawatts of capacity, placing stress on the  
25 ability to meet electricity demand in California during a

1 heat wave.

2 Next slide, please.

3 With the effects of climate change, including  
4 extreme heat and wildfires, challenging the state's ability  
5 to maintain grid reliability, as part of the Budget Act of  
6 2022, the state created a Strategic Reliability Reserve in  
7 AB 205 to help meet grid needs during extreme events. The  
8 authorizing statute notes that, quote,

9 "As California transitions to a clean energy future  
10 and contends with climate impacts and other  
11 challenges, sufficient capacity of new and generation  
12 assets will be required to maintain reliability during  
13 extreme events," end quote.

14 The Reserve includes three programs.

15 The Electricity Supply Strategic Reliability  
16 Reserve Program is managed by the Department of Water  
17 Resources to secure additional energy resources and extend  
18 the life of retiring facilities to support grid reliability  
19 during extreme events. Currently, the program largely  
20 consists of natural gas-powered resources with up to 3,100  
21 megawatts of capacity.

22 The DEBA and DSGS programs are administered by  
23 the Energy Commission. DEBA incentivizes cleaner or more  
24 efficient resources that serve as on-call emergency supply  
25 or load reduction during extreme events. The Demand Side

1 Grid Support Program incentivizes dispatchable customer  
2 load reduction and backup generation operation.

3 DSGS launched in 2022 and staff has worked with  
4 industry to grow it to over one gigawatt of predominantly  
5 clean capacity, including one of the largest behind-the-  
6 meter storage virtual power plants in the country.

7 Next slide, please.

8 The DEBA authorizing statute in AB 205 directs  
9 the Energy Commission to fund two types of projects. The  
10 first category includes efficiency upgrades, maintenance,  
11 and capacity additions to existing power generators. And  
12 the second category consists of deployment of new zero- or  
13 low-emission technologies, including but not limited to  
14 fuel cells or energy storage at existing or new facilities.

15 After adopting program guidelines in October 2023  
16 through a public process in consultation with the  
17 California Air Resources Board, the DEBA Program released  
18 its first solicitation in December 2023. The solicitation  
19 was for the first category of projects.

20 The Notice of Proposed Awards from this  
21 solicitation was issued in April 2024. It included the  
22 efficiency upgrades proposed at the Magnolia Power Project  
23 under consideration for approval today. After releasing a  
24 draft solicitation for up to \$250 million for new zero- or  
25 low-emission technologies for public comment in March 2024,

1 release of the final solicitation was paused because of  
2 program budget changes. Program staff anticipate releasing  
3 a solicitation in 2026 after having received funding from  
4 Proposition 4 in September of this year.

5 Next slide, please.

6 As part of the DEBA Program under the Strategic  
7 Reliability Reserve, these two proposed agreements will  
8 support grid reliability by increasing the efficiency of an  
9 existing power plant during hot weather, optimizing  
10 California's existing infrastructure and ability to provide  
11 power during heat waves while reducing California's  
12 reliance on dirtier and less efficient fossil resources.

13 Per each agreement, the incremental capacity resulting from  
14 these projects must be made available during grid  
15 emergencies for a term of five years from each project  
16 online date.

17 Next slide, please.

18 The purpose of the DEBA bulk grid solicitation  
19 was to strengthen electric grid reliability by funding  
20 efficiency upgrades and clean capacity additions to  
21 existing bulk grid power generators. Consistent with  
22 program statute and guidelines, the solicitation  
23 prioritized zero- and low-emission resources and then  
24 efficiency improvements for conventional resources.

25 Additionally, the solicitation reiterated the

1 need to comply with the state's climate and air quality  
2 requirements, such as Senate Bill 100. Specifically,  
3 eligible projects cannot extend the estimated useful life  
4 of a power generator in contravention of the state's  
5 climate and air quality requirements. Applications were  
6 evaluated based on financial need, contribution to  
7 reliability, project readiness, climate and air quality  
8 requirements, budget and cost effectiveness, and a  
9 measurement and verification plan.

10           The Notice of Proposed Awards released in April  
11 2024 recommended five energy storage projects and four  
12 conventional resource efficiency projects for a total of  
13 almost \$123 million in grant funding, anticipated to bring  
14 297 megawatts incremental capacity online by June 2027 to  
15 support California's grid with nearly three quarters of the  
16 capacity from storage.

17           To date, the Energy Commission has approved five  
18 agreements related to the DEBA bulk grid solicitation. We  
19 plan to bring additional agreements for consideration at  
20 future business meetings.

21           Next slide, please.

22           This agenda item includes two grant agreements.  
23 Each agreement is for a separate project at the Southern  
24 California Public Power Authority's Magnolia Power Project,  
25 one for an advanced compressor upgrade and another for an

1 advanced gas path upgrade. The previous agenda item  
2 included both proposed DEBA projects in the Petition to  
3 Amend the Magnolia Power Project license. The combined 54  
4 megawatts of increased capacity from both projects is  
5 within the Magnolia Power Project's approved  
6 interconnection threshold set by the California Independent  
7 System Operator, allowing the facility to gain immediate  
8 benefit without a new deliverability study.

9 Next slide, please.

10 Under the proposed first agreement, the  
11 compressor will increase flow rate and will include  
12 technology that enhances hot day and partial load system  
13 efficiency. Under the second agreement, the improvements  
14 from the Advanced Gas Path Project would allow the turbine  
15 to improve its thermal energy conversion process with new  
16 hot gas path components, materials improvements, and  
17 updated design to minimize stress and improve cooling  
18 efficiency.

19 Each project can be implemented separately. When  
20 combined with the 24 megawatt advanced gas path upgrade,  
21 the advanced compressor upgrade adds up to 30 megawatts for  
22 a total of 54 megawatts at 77 degrees Fahrenheit ambient  
23 temperature.

24 It is also important to note that the cost per  
25 megawatt for these improvements is significantly lower than

1 the NREL annual technology baseline cost for a combined  
2 cycle power plant, which is \$1.7 million per megawatt.

3 Next slide, please.

4 Staff recommends the Energy Commission adopt the  
5 findings and determinations that no further environmental  
6 review is necessary under CEQA, and the Energy Commission  
7 approve the proposed grant agreements with the City of  
8 Burbank.

9 I would like to thank staff from the Siting  
10 Division, Administrative Services Division, and the Chief  
11 Counsel's Office for their support and assistance with  
12 these projects.

13 This concludes staff's presentation. We are  
14 available to answer any questions you may have.

15 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Thank you so much, Pam.

16 With that, we'll go to public comment.

17 MR. YOUNG: Thank you, Chair.

18 The California Energy Commission welcomes public  
19 comment on Items 2 and 3 at this time. We will start with  
20 attendees in the room and then move to those who are  
21 joining us virtually and by phone via Zoom.

22 If you are joining us here at the in-person  
23 location, just a reminder that you would like to make a  
24 comment, you can notify us by scanning and adding your name  
25 to the queue using the QR code posted in the back.

1           If you are joining us by Zoom or phone, please  
2 let us know you'd like to make a comment by using the  
3 raised hand feature on Zoom. If you are online, you'll  
4 click on the open palm at the bottom of your screen to  
5 raise your hand. and if you're joining us by phone, please  
6 press star nine.

7           I would like to first call on folks in the room.  
8 I would like to welcome Mandip Sarma. Please approach the  
9 podium, spell your name for the record, and welcome your  
10 public comment.

11           MS. SAMRA: Great. Thank you. Mandip Samra,  
12 M-A-N-D-I-P. Last name is Samra, S-A-M-R-A.

13           So first of all, I want to say thank you for  
14 allowing us to be here, so thank you, Chair, Vice Chair,  
15 CEC Commissioners, and CEC staff. My name is Mandip Samra.  
16 I'm the General Manager of Burbank Water and Power. I'm  
17 here today to ask for support for the two DEBA grants here  
18 before you.

19           The Magnolia Power Project is actually owned by  
20 the Southern California Public Power Authority. Burbank  
21 Water and Power is the operating agent of the plant. The  
22 plant is located in the City of Burbank on our 10-acre eco-  
23 campus. It provides critical, reliable power for six  
24 participants, Anaheim, Burbank, Pasadena, Glendale,  
25 Cerritos, and Colton.

1           The urgency of this project was determined with  
2 the heat dome events that we've had over the last few  
3 years. Burbank Water and Power work closely with the  
4 Governor's Office and the CEC to strategize how to better  
5 utilize the Magnolia Power Project to work closely during  
6 these heat dome events.

7           The DEBA grants before you today do two things,  
8 efficiency upgrades to the project and emergency capacity  
9 for the state's electrical grid during reliability events  
10 or extreme events. As utilities add more renewables to the  
11 grid, it is vital to have in-basin generation. I think  
12 today is a great example. It's cloudy outside, so solar  
13 would not be producing today, so you definitely need that  
14 baseload generation. The upgrade does not increase the  
15 nameplate capacity. It improves the reliability and  
16 efficiency and provides additional reliability for the  
17 state's grid.

18           From an air quality perspective, it was approved  
19 by AQMD as well as the US EPA. Staff determined that the  
20 upgrades meet the CEC siting requirements. MPP has really  
21 state-of-the-art air emissions control systems. We also  
22 have a very innovative water treatment system and  
23 stormwater capture system with zero liquid discharge. In  
24 addition, we use a lot of advanced air pollution devices.

25           This grant will enable the Magnolia Power Project

1 to operate more efficiently, support the integration of  
2 renewable resources, and enhance grid reliability.

3 I would like to thank the CEC team members for  
4 working collaboratively with us on this project.

5 Okay, two minutes.

6 MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comment.

7 I'm next going to turn to Frank Massineo, and  
8 then Elisabeth de Jong.

9 Frank, please approach the podium. State and  
10 spell your name for the record as well as your affiliation.

11 MR. MESSINEO: Good afternoon. My name is Frank  
12 Massineo, F-R-A-N-K M-E-S-S-I-N-E-O. I'm the Production  
13 Manager with Burbank Water and Power. And I'd like to  
14 provide a few comments for your consideration this  
15 afternoon.

16 These projects are for grid reliability and  
17 essentially until more reliable renewables can be brought  
18 online, and that's going to take time. MPP is used to  
19 balance renewables. And in 2020, we implemented a project  
20 to reduce the turndown output of the plant. That brought  
21 our minimum output from 165 megawatts to 87 megawatts.  
22 This allowed use of more renewables when they are  
23 available.

24 And these projects will allow better summer  
25 performance when more energy is needed. This will be

1 offset with other periods when renewables are available.  
2 So on an annual basis, we don't anticipate there's actually  
3 going to be any emission increase. And if you look at the  
4 AQMD air permit, we did implement an 85 percent capacity  
5 factor in there that reflects the strategy on how this will  
6 be used.

7 I'd just like to thank you for your time and  
8 consideration.

9 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

10 I'd next like to welcome Elisabeth de Jong, and  
11 then we'll go to Priscilla Quiroz.

12 Elisabeth, please state and spell your name for  
13 the record. We welcome your public comment.

14 MS. DE JONG: Thank you. My name is Elizabeth  
15 DeJong, E-L-I-S-A-B-E-T-H, de Jong, D-E space J-O-N-G. I'm  
16 here on behalf of the Southern California Public Power  
17 Authority, or SCPPA, a Joint Powers Authority with 12 local  
18 publicly owned electric utility members. Our member  
19 utilities are dedicated to achieving the state's clean  
20 energy goals. In fact, several of our members have more  
21 aggressive goals than the state.

22 The Magnolia Power Project has been an important  
23 joint public power resource since it began commercial  
24 operations in 2005, reliably serving the project  
25 participants, including the cities of Anaheim, Burbank,

1 Cerritos, Colton, Glendale, and Pasadena for nearly two  
2 decades. It has been an important asset during our clean  
3 energy transition with the ability to ramp up and down to  
4 accommodate intermittent renewables. The proposed upgrades  
5 presented today are efficiency improvements that will make  
6 this existing plant more responsive during heat waves and  
7 other extreme weather events, when reliable dispatchable  
8 generation is critical to maintaining grid stability and  
9 keeping communities safe.

10 It should be noted that this project does not in  
11 any way affect the unprecedented efforts that SCPPA is  
12 making on behalf of its members to aggressively invest in  
13 new renewable energy and storage resources to meet local  
14 and state clean energy goals. In recent years, SCPPA's  
15 resource portfolio has grown to 36 renewable and zero-  
16 carbon projects.

17 We greatly appreciate the CEC's staff's thorough  
18 and timely work to evaluate this amendment and I thank you  
19 for your consideration.

20 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

21 We'd now like to welcome Priscilla Quiroz.  
22 Please approach the podium, state and spell your name for  
23 the record. Comments will be two minutes or less. We  
24 welcome your public comment.

25 MS. QUOROZ: P-R-I-S-C-I-L-L-A, and last name

1 Q-U-I-R-O-Z. So good afternoon. Priscilla Quiroz here on  
2 behalf of the California Municipal Utilities Association,  
3 known as CMUA, representing 85 publicly owned electric,  
4 gas, water, and wastewater utilities statewide.

5 We're here today to voice our strong support for  
6 Item 2, the Magnolia Power Project and respectfully urge  
7 the commission's approval on this. These improvements are  
8 essential for maintaining grid reliability as utilities  
9 statewide continue integrating significant amounts of  
10 renewable resources. The proposed grant aligns squarely  
11 with the provisions of DEBA, which focuses on two primary  
12 objectives, improving efficiency upgrades to existing  
13 plants, adding capacity to existing power generators in  
14 California that will serve as an emergency supply for the  
15 state's electrical grid during extreme events.

16 As you heard, the project followed a proper  
17 public process. In addition to, as staff has stated, the  
18 staff found that the proposed upgrades comply with CEC  
19 siting regulations and do not pose significant or  
20 disproportionate impacts to low income or minority  
21 communities and raise no environmental justice concerns.

22 So for these reasons, CMUA strongly urges the  
23 commission to support this project, which will help  
24 reliability, affordability, and sustainability for  
25 California's electrical system.

1 Thank you.

2 MR. YOUNG: Thank you so much.

3 Seeing no other members of the public in the room  
4 that wish to make a public comment, I'm going to transition  
5 to Zoom. Just a reminder that if you're joining us online,  
6 please let us know you'd like to make a public comment by  
7 using the raise-hand feature on Zoom. And if you're on the  
8 phone, please press star nine to raise your hand.

9 I'm first going to return to Tom Kunhardt. Tom,  
10 I'm unmuting your line. Please state and spell your name  
11 for the record. Comments will be two minutes or less.

12 MR. KUNHARDT: (Off mic) -- N-H-A-R-D-T. I'm a  
13 concerned citizen, live in Oakland, California. I've been  
14 a resident of California since 1977. And I'm a member of  
15 multiple different organizations as a volunteer since I  
16 retired a year ago.

17 Basically, I would like to voice opposition to  
18 this item on expanding Magnolia Power Plant. Folks who  
19 have spoken before me have been very eloquent in making  
20 their case, and I respect their opinion and their  
21 recommendation. But I think approving this project would  
22 allow the spending of money that we really -- that's funded  
23 by taxpayers, and it increases gas capacity. It's locking  
24 in millions of dollars into a power plant that we really  
25 need to retire in less than 20 years. And I feel it's

1 really a waste of investment in taxpayer dollars. We can  
2 spend that money much sooner and put assets in the ground  
3 much sooner that are clean, particularly storage, as well,  
4 to create that baseload need.

5           So I think, you know, we don't need the  
6 additional pollution that will likely happen in this area  
7 where it's already a very stressed and polluted community  
8 in California. And they're already, you know, experiencing  
9 really high ozone and particulate matter pollution. In  
10 terms of climate justice and equity, it's really going to  
11 be harmful to the folks that are already taking the brunt  
12 of the NOx and the CO and the DOC pollution in that area.  
13 So I would really strongly recommend a no vote on this  
14 proposal.

15           Thank you.

16           MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

17           We're next going to turn to David Marrett.  
18 David, please unmute on your end. We're opening your line.  
19 Please spell your name for the record, state any  
20 affiliation, and begin your comment. We're asking for  
21 comments to be two minutes or less. Thank you. David, you  
22 might want to try unmuting on your end.

23           MR. MARRETT: Can you hear me now?

24           MR. YOUNG: We can. Thank you.

25           MR. MARRETT: Yeah. Thank you, Commissioners,

1 for this opportunity. My name is David Marrett,  
2 M-A-R-R-E-T-T. I'm a Ph.D. environmental scientist, an  
3 educator, and a clean air advocate. I'm speaking for  
4 myself, but I'm active in several organizations, including  
5 the Sierra Club and Third Act. And I'm here in opposition  
6 to the expansion of this gas plant, this Magnolia gas  
7 plant, for two main reasons.

8           The first relates to air quality and air  
9 pollution/public health. The entire South Coast air  
10 quality basin is in extreme noncompliance for its  
11 unacceptably poor air quality. The communities around this  
12 plant are in the 98th percentile overall per pollution  
13 burden. So from both a regional and a local perspective,  
14 we should be phasing out and shutting down gas plants, not  
15 upgrading and expanding them.

16           The second reason is very simple. The expansion  
17 of gas plants goes directly against California's stated  
18 climate goals in SB 100 and SB 887.

19           Thank you for this opportunity to speak.

20           MR. YOUNG: Thank you for your comment.

21           Sandy Krasner, we're going to unmute your line.  
22 Please state and spell your name for the record and state  
23 the affiliation and begin your comment. We're asking for  
24 comments two minutes or less.

25           MR. KRASNER: Hello, my name is Sandy Krasner,

1 K-R-A-S-N-E-R. Can you hear me okay?

2 MR. YOUNG: We sure can. Thank you.

3 MR. KRASNER: Yes, I'm the group lead for the  
4 Pasadena Chapter of Citizens Climate Lobby. I'd like to  
5 speak to vote no on the Magnolia expansion.

6 What is the rationale for expanding the capacity  
7 of Magnolia? Is there a critical shortage of capacity? Is  
8 this necessary to avoid blackouts? The Magnolia update  
9 increases the capacity by about one percent of the Oregon  
10 Bootleg outage that was cited. The last CAISO rolling  
11 blackout was in 2020. This has been due primarily to the  
12 increase in solar and battery storage.

13 We're in the middle of a climate crisis. The  
14 definition of insanity is to keep doing the same thing and  
15 expecting different results. When you're in a hole, the  
16 first thing to do is to stop digging.

17 Why are we investing \$72 million in what will  
18 soon become a stranded asset: Magnolia? Why should we be  
19 spending \$72 million so we can spend an increasing amount  
20 for natural gas when renewable energy is much cheaper? The  
21 U.S. Energy and Information Administration expects the cost  
22 of natural gas to industrial users will increase by 21  
23 percent in 2025 with continuing rises in out years.

24 For the same \$72 million, we could install a 40-  
25 megawatt or 160-megawatt-hour battery electric storage

1 system. It's got much quicker response time. It will  
2 allow us to do rate arbitrage. It will allow us to store  
3 excess energy midday when it's nearly free and return it  
4 during evening peaks.

5 In addition, the staff assessments say that this  
6 upgrade will increase by about 1.5 percent of the CO2  
7 emitted per year. I know technically we fall below the  
8 AQMD significant impact thresholds, but really, this is a  
9 significant environmental impact to climate and air  
10 pollution.

11 I appreciate your time. Vote no on this  
12 expansion. Thank you very much.

13 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

14 Now I'm going to recognize ActiveSGV. Active,  
15 we're going to unmute your line. Please state and spell  
16 your name for the record. We're asking for comments to be  
17 two minutes or less. Thank you.

18 MR. REUTIMANN: Hi. Good afternoon. This is Wes  
19 Reutimann, R-E-U-T-I-M-A-N-N. I'm speaking on behalf of  
20 Active San Gabriel Valley. We are a nonprofit organization  
21 focused on supporting a equitable San Gabriel Valley. As  
22 an organization, we strongly oppose the proposed expansion  
23 of gas use in Magnolia.

24 Despite decades of Federal Clean Air Act  
25 standards, the South Coast Air Quality Management District

1 has never met federal air quality standards for our region.  
2 Our air basin remains among the most polluted in the United  
3 States. We are an extreme nonattainment zone for ozone  
4 pollution, and our air quality has been getting worse after  
5 decades of steady improvements.

6           The cost of all this pollution is billions each  
7 and every year. Childhood asthma, missed days of school  
8 and work, preventable heart attacks, cancers, other  
9 respiratory illnesses. And the fact that the US EPA has  
10 not provided any comment on this process is truly  
11 irrelevant. Sadly, as you know, the US EPA is not  
12 currently focused on protecting public health or the  
13 environment.

14           Spending over \$70 million in taxpayer money to  
15 burn more polluting methane gas in the most -- one of the  
16 most polluted regions in the United States is not an  
17 upgrade. It is throwing good money into what needs to  
18 become a stranded asset. An upgrade would be investing in  
19 zero-emission, non-polluting battery storage and charging  
20 these batteries during periods of excess solar energy  
21 generation that are now common in Southern California.  
22 Such an investment would not be a stranded asset in 10 or  
23 20 years.

24           As CEC Commissioners, you are well aware of how  
25 effective the addition of battery storage has been to

1 California's grid in avoiding summer blackouts over the  
2 past several years. Please reject this request and invest  
3 this funding into zero-emission distributed energy  
4 resources. Please vote no.

5 Thank you.

6 MR. YOUNG: Thank you. Peter Eisenhardt, we're  
7 going to unmute your line. Please unmute on your end,  
8 spell your name for the record, state and affiliation, and  
9 begin your public comment. We're asking for comments to be  
10 two minutes or less. Thank you. Peter, you might want to  
11 unmute on your end. We welcome your public comment.

12 MR. EISENHARDT: Hello. Can you hear me?

13 MR. YOUNG: We can. Thank you.

14 MR. EISENHARDT: Sorry. Yes. Peter Eisenhardt,  
15 P-E-T-E-R, Eisenhardt, E-I-S-E-N-H-A-R-D-T. I am a  
16 resident of Altadena, scene of this year's Eaton Fire,  
17 which has made it all too clear that the climate emergency  
18 is upon us.

19 I lead the Environmental Organization at  
20 Neighborhood Unitarian Universalist Church in Pasadena,  
21 which is one of the members of the Pasadena 100 Coalition.  
22 The Pasadena 100 Coalition has worked with the City of  
23 Pasadena to set a goal of 100 percent carbon-free  
24 electricity by the end of 2030. And we are hoping to  
25 achieve that goal, but we recently discovered that the

1 Magnolia Power Plant was likely to undercut our efforts to  
2 meet that goal.

3           We heard earlier that the plant has been in  
4 successful operation for a couple of decades, and that this  
5 will update it. What we need to be doing is not invest in  
6 the past. We need to invest in the future. We need to  
7 recognize the climate emergency that is upon us.

8           Please vote against this and vote in favor of  
9 renewable energy, which is a better option and a better use  
10 of taxpayer funds for addressing the goals of the DEBA.

11           Thank you.

12           MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

13           Carl and Carol Selkin, we're going to unmute your  
14 line. Please unmute on your end, spell your name for the  
15 record, state any affiliation. We're asking for comments  
16 to be two minutes or less. We welcome your public comment.  
17 Carl and Carol Selkin, you might want to unmute on your  
18 end. We welcome your public comment. All right, we will  
19 come back. We will come back to you, Carl and Carol  
20 Selkin.

21           We're next going to ask for Ron Martin to unmute  
22 your line. Please spell your name for the record, state  
23 any affiliation, and begin your comment.

24           MR. MARTIN: My name is Ronald J. Martin,  
25 R-O-N-A-L-D J. M-A-R-T-I-N. I'm the Conservation Chair of

1 the (indiscernible) chapter of the Sierra Club and member  
2 of Sierra Club California's Energy Climate Committee. And  
3 I'm speaking against the grants to enhance the Magnolia  
4 Power Plant.

5 The purpose of the California Energy Commission  
6 is to move away from the burning of fossil fuels, so this  
7 goes against your own goal, and it goes against SB 100's  
8 goals for California to move away from burning fossil  
9 fuels, and SB 888, which makes it illegal to enhance  
10 methane gas use.

11 California should be a leader in climate change.  
12 The whole world is watching us. We are the ones in the  
13 United States who are aware of the danger of climate change  
14 and should be the ones taking action to reverse what's  
15 going on with our atmosphere.

16 Pacific Gas & Electric had power outages to  
17 reduce fire danger. Outages happen. If there are a few  
18 outages on the way to using the grant money to purchase  
19 renewable energy, solar panels, and batteries to take care  
20 of the times when the sun isn't shining, that's what we  
21 should do.

22 So please do not approve this enhancement of  
23 methane gas burning.

24 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

25 We're next going to turn to Julia Dowell. Julia,

1 I'm opening your line. Please unmute on your end, spell  
2 your name for the record, state any affiliation, and begin  
3 your comment. We're asking for comments to be two minutes  
4 or less.

5 MS. DOWELL: Hello, Commissioners. My name is  
6 Julia Dowell, D-O-W-E-L-L, and I am here today on behalf of  
7 Sierra Club. I'm a Senior Campaign Organizer with Sierra  
8 Club, working to get California to transition to 100  
9 percent clean energy.

10 Sierra Club is very concerned about the proposal  
11 to expand the Magnolia Power Plant, especially the --  
12 what's included in the petition to increase emissions  
13 limits for NOx, carbon monoxide, and VOCs. We're really  
14 concerned that this would exacerbate air quality issues in  
15 the South Coast Air Basin, which is already in extreme non-  
16 attainment for ozone, and we are especially concerned that  
17 this will take California away from its climate goals.

18 We would really want to see investments in  
19 battery storage to reach the capacity needed rather than  
20 expanding gas. Battery storage can, as you know, ramp up  
21 quickly and help us reach our reliability goals.

22 And I also just want to say, we are especially  
23 concerned with DEBA funding being used to expand capacity  
24 at this gas plant. I know that there are energy efficiency  
25 upgrades associated with this, but we do not want to see

1 any gas capacity expansion or increase in air emissions.

2 So I really hope that you take all of our  
3 concerns and the concerns that you've heard here today into  
4 account. We really want to help the CEC reach its 100  
5 percent clean energy goals, and are concerned that this  
6 project is in direct opposition to that.

7 So thank you, and please reject this proposal.

8 MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

9 At this time, I'd like to return to Carl and  
10 Selkin. Carl and Carol, please unmute on your end. Spell  
11 your name for the record, state an affiliation, and begin  
12 your comment.

13 MR. SELKIN: Great. Can you hear me now?

14 MR. YOUNG: We sure can. Thank you.

15 MR. SELKIN: Okay. Thank you. So my name is  
16 Carl Selkin, C-A-R-L, last name Selkin, S-E-L-K-I-N. I'm  
17 Co-Chair of the Social Justice Committee of Pasadena Jewish  
18 Temple and Center. While I speak for myself, our committee  
19 is a participant in Pasadena 100 and has a longstanding  
20 commitment to fight against actions that undermine progress  
21 toward the rapid transition to carbon-free electricity. I  
22 urge a no vote.

23 Our synagogue was destroyed in the Eaton Fire, so  
24 I am moved to speak now against this ill-advised move to  
25 waste money and opportunity on the Magnolia generator of

1 toxic pollution poison from every point in the destructive  
2 cycle of fossil gas. The short-term fallacious benefits of  
3 this multi-million dollar sunk investment prolongs the  
4 status quo, supplying a continuing lifeline to the dinosaur  
5 fossil fuel providers. We would be better served by \$70  
6 million invested in carcinogen-free solar electricity and  
7 battery storage.

8           Much has changed since 2020. The future is non-  
9 carbon-based electricity, DER, and battery storage. That  
10 is the only rational path to reliable, cost-effective, and  
11 resilient power. Stop preparing for the past rather than  
12 investing in the future.

13           Thank you so much for this opportunity.

14           MR. YOUNG: Thank you.

15           I'm going to turn to Leslie. Leslie, I'm opening  
16 your line. Please unmute on your end, spell your name for  
17 the record, state any affiliation, and begin your public  
18 comment. We're asking for comments to be two minutes or  
19 less. Thank you.

20           MS. PURCELL: This is Leslie Purcell. Can you  
21 hear me?

22           MR. YOUNG: We can hear you.

23           MS. PURCELL: Great. L-E-S-L-I-E P-U-R-C-E-L-L.  
24 And I'm calling in to support the comments by the Sierra  
25 Club, Julia Dowell, and others against this expansion and

1 continuing the life of this Magnolia Power Plant.

2 As you know, we need to transition off of these  
3 fuels. Methane gas, natural gas, is highly polluting and a  
4 big climate factor. And there are many, many opportunities  
5 for commercial, industrial, municipal buildings and parking  
6 lots for solar. And then we could have battery storage and  
7 do distributed energy resources, which would be much more  
8 efficient and would take care of any extra power needs. So  
9 we need to move to 100 percent, as soon as possible, clean  
10 power.

11 Thank you very much.

12 MR. YOUNG: Thank you so much.

13 Chair, this appears to conclude public comment  
14 back to you.

15 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Okay. Well, let me thank all  
16 the members of the public for sharing your comments.

17 We'll begin now with questions from the dais and  
18 then move to discussion, so starting with the Vice Chair.

19 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you, Chair. I have a  
20 few clarifying questions. Maybe we'll tag team on some of  
21 this.

22 I just wanted to confirm from our team, from the  
23 CEC team, that the proposed efficiency upgrades do not  
24 increase the nameplate capacity of the power plant?

25 MS. GUTIERREZ: That is correct.

1           VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Ashley, I think just  
2 confirming what I heard from you, that this is essentially  
3 offsetting the thermal degradates during summer extreme  
4 weather.

5           MS. GUTIERREZ: That is correct.

6           VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you. So second, I just  
7 want to maybe kind of talk through a couple of other  
8 pieces. In terms of less than significant finding, the  
9 exact, can you explain what less than significant means in  
10 terms of the overall emission impacts?

11          DR. QIAN: Hi Vice Chair. My name is Wenjun  
12 Qian, Quality and Public Health Supervisor.

13           In terms of less than significant impact, staff  
14 analyzed the criteria air pollutant concentration and  
15 compared with the applicable ambient air quality standards  
16 and we found that the impacts would be less than the  
17 applicable ambient air quality standards.

18           And with regards to public health impacts, we  
19 also compared the health risks with the air district's  
20 significant thresholds. And those are below the air  
21 district's thresholds.

22          VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Did you -- yeah. So we'll  
23 come back to you, Wenjun. Thank you so much.

24           I just wanted to ask the representative, Director  
25 Mandip Samra, can I ask a couple of questions? In terms of

1 the Burbank's projects that you were thinking through, I  
2 mean, we've heard some comments on potentially looking at  
3 other alternatives other than just the efficiency upgrades.  
4 Could you comment on, you know, some of the alternatives  
5 that you've explored internally? I know it's on the  
6 ecosystem -- sorry, the EcoCampus, which is limited in its  
7 land, but just wanted to kind of get your thoughts on as  
8 you are thinking through the Burbank's IRP and long term  
9 planning, how does -- you know, how did you look at  
10 different alternatives and how does this fit into the  
11 broader program?

12 MS. SAMRA: Yes. Mandip Samara.

13 So one of the things that we have looked at is  
14 long-duration battery energy storage systems. So we do  
15 actually have an iron flow battery on our EcoCampus that  
16 was installed in May of 2024. We got an American Public  
17 Power Association grant for that.

18 We're also exploring, like one of the commenters  
19 said, solar combined with long-duration battery storage on  
20 our city facilities, as well as rooftops for our EcoCampus.  
21 We actually did an upgrade for all of our rooftops to get  
22 it ready for solar.

23 The other things that we'll continue to look at  
24 is we have another four acres, because we have a power  
25 plant there that's going to come down, we're going to look

1 at more additional long-duration battery storage. Lithium-  
2 ion, as we know, is not long duration. It's four hours and  
3 it lasts about eight years. So we're looking at long  
4 duration, six to eight hours, 20-plus years. And we have a  
5 limited space so we are looking at that.

6 So we are an EcoCampus. We like to test out  
7 technologies. And this is one of the ways that we're doing  
8 is making this unit more efficient.

9 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Just a couple more questions.

10 In terms of the kind of local reliability and the  
11 transmission constraints, can you comment? I think we've  
12 had a conversation about this. And for the benefit of the  
13 public, could you just comment on the specific constraints  
14 on the local reliability and why kind of the efficiency  
15 project in terms of having that firm dispatchable power  
16 would be helpful for your local reliability?

17 MS. SAMRA: And so I'll kind of focus on Burbank  
18 here, but also our adjacent cities. So Burbank Water and  
19 Power is part of the Los Angeles Balancing Authority, but  
20 we also have four other participants that are part of the  
21 CAISO. So this counts as resource adequacy in the system  
22 level for CAISO. And for the LAPA, it provides spinning  
23 reserves.

24 Days like this are examples of why we need this  
25 resource. It really is there to help with the renewable

1 transition and to be able to provide flexible baseload  
2 power. The efficiency improvements we did in 2020 allowed  
3 the unit to go from 165 megawatts down to 87, but also ramp  
4 up and down in five minute intervals. That really helps a  
5 lot of the CAISO participants.

6 We have net import limitations with the adjoining  
7 cities. So Pasadena, Glendale and Burbank all have net  
8 import limitations, meaning we cannot bring an excess of  
9 energy into our system and we do have to rely on local  
10 units. And this is an in-basin, one of the very few in-  
11 basin combined cycle plants, and it is one of the most  
12 efficient in the nation.

13 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you. Just one last  
14 process question and I'll pass it to Commissioner Gallardo.

15 So one of the things we're all doing, whether  
16 it's at the state level, local level, we're trying to  
17 figure out the ideal way to move towards the clean,  
18 reliable, affordable goals. I think these are tough  
19 choices, especially when we continue to invest in fossil  
20 generation that we want to move away from. I think it's a  
21 stated goal for the state and also Burbank.

22 Could you just share with us, how does your  
23 public process go? I mean, you are trying to figure out  
24 how to manage and ensure that the public process, you know,  
25 you're hearing the comments, trying to figure out what's

1 the best path forward. And I recognize that, you know, as  
2 POU's, you're also public servants. So like what's -- like  
3 how are you thinking about taking into account the comments  
4 and planning for an equitable transition?

5 MS. SAMRA: I'll speak from two perspectives.  
6 One is our Integrated Resources Plan. When we did that  
7 back in 2024 and 2023, we actually held over 13 meetings  
8 with our Stakeholder Technical Advisory Group for public  
9 meetings that were attended anywhere from 10 people to 100  
10 people. And we also went to City Council, City Council is  
11 the governing authority, a few times to get updates on  
12 that.

13 With this project in particular, we have a  
14 Burbank Water and Power Board. Our Board voted unanimously  
15 on this project because of the efficiency improvements.  
16 And it also went to City Council. Our City Council  
17 approved this as well. So that's the process for this.

18 But historically, Burbank is really one of the  
19 few utilities that's very transparent. We're out there. I  
20 do coffee with the GM once a month where members of the  
21 public come out and talk to me. I want to engage. I look  
22 forward to engaging with the environmental groups such as  
23 Pasadena 100, Sierra Club, and others to really look for a  
24 path forward that is clean, but also a transition towards  
25 that clean grid that we need to get to.

1 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you so much.

2 I'll pass it to Commissioner Gallardo.

3 COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: So this question might be  
4 for you, Mandip, or maybe for Elisabeth from SCPPA. I was  
5 just curious if the upgrades that we're talking about for  
6 the Magnolia Power Project could be done without DEBA.  
7 Were they already in planning?

8 MS. SAMRA: So we did do one in 2020. But this  
9 one, we really needed those funds. I think all of us are  
10 going through rate increases and rate adjustments and  
11 really to limit the impact on the ratepayer base for all  
12 six cities that are participants, we looked after what the  
13 DEBA grant offers, which is efficiency improvements, and to  
14 backstop for reliability during the summer heat events,  
15 which we continually have. Even days like we're going to  
16 need this type of resource when solar or wind or other  
17 renewables cannot come onto the system.

18 So we do partner with everybody. We really are  
19 trying to limit disproportionate rate impacts, and we  
20 looked at the DEBA grant as a source for that.

21 COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: Excellent. And then I  
22 was going to ask this to staff, but I'll also ask you from  
23 your perspective. One of the commenters indicated that it  
24 wouldn't be necessary to have this upgrade or expansion, I  
25 think it was mentioned, to avoid blackouts. From your

1 perspective, is it helpful or even necessary to do this  
2 type of upgrade for avoiding blackouts?

3 MS. SAMRA: So I will highlight, Burbank is the  
4 operating agent. We are actually the top five percent of  
5 reliable utilities in the nation, of publicly-owned  
6 utilities. There's 2,200 publicly-owned utilities. We're  
7 in the top five percent. We've been an R3 rating through  
8 the American Public Power Association for decades now. So  
9 that is really something that we're striving for.

10 This helps with limiting those blackouts or  
11 brownouts. We haven't had any since I've been in the helm.  
12 We had the windstorm. We did not have major outages. We  
13 did not have brownouts. We do power Hollywood, we do power  
14 a lot of large commercial customers, and that is a big  
15 portion of California's economy as well. So we are looking  
16 to maintain the economy while also maintaining high  
17 reliability, and this helps with that, as well as the six  
18 other -- five other participants as well.

19 COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: Excellent. Thank you  
20 very much.

21 Then, I'll turn to staff. Same question. You  
22 know, from your perspective, do you think it's helpful or  
23 even necessary for avoiding blackouts? And I'm not sure  
24 who wants to respond to that.

25 MS. CARRILLO: Good afternoon, Commissioners.

1 Deana Carrillo, Division Director of RREDI. My division is  
2 responsible for the CEC's of the Strategic Reliability  
3 Reserve.

4           Given the acts that happened in both 2020, as  
5 well as the extreme heat in 2022, much of the statutory  
6 mandate that requires us to establish the Strategic  
7 Reliability Reserve, at this point, policy leadership does  
8 see a need to have a Strategic Reliability Reserve to help  
9 address climate change as we navigate to clean energy for  
10 2045.

11           COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: Thank you.

12           MS. CARRILLO: Thank you.

13           COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: I appreciate it, Deana.

14           Then, one other question. I think, Wenjun, this  
15 might be for you on air quality. I'm not the scientist  
16 commissioner, so let's just clarify that right now. I'm  
17 the lawyer Commissioner. But from what I understood, for  
18 worst-case emissions of the criteria pollutants, like the  
19 NOx and VOCs, in terms of pounds per megawatt hour  
20 generated, there would actually be a decrease. And I think  
21 I saw the numbers were from three to nine percent,  
22 depending on the ambient temperature conditions. Can you  
23 speak to us about that a little bit more?

24           DR. QIAN: Yeah. So with the efficiency  
25 upgrades, the heat rate would decrease, which means less

1 fuel is needed to produce the same amount of electricity.  
2 Therefore, we looked at emissions and the capacity at the  
3 different temperatures and we calculated the pounds per  
4 megawatt hour produced. And we found that there will be  
5 three to nine percent of decrease of emissions in terms of  
6 pounds of pollutants per megawatt hour.

7 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Can you remind me what the  
8 heat rate is for this?

9 DR. QIAN: Huh?

10 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: This is combined cycle; right?  
11 What is the heat rate, if you remember offhand --

12 DR. QIAN: It's --

13 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: -- 6,000 or 7,000, something  
14 like that?

15 DR. QIAN: Let me see.

16 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Does anybody know? Do you  
17 know offhand? Yeah, go ahead, sir, if you know it.

18 MR. MESSINEO: Good afternoon. Frank Massimino  
19 with Burbank Water and Power once again. The heat rate is  
20 about 6,800.

21 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Thank you.

22 And Wenjun, I also wanted to thank you for  
23 reading the comments that were provided by and filed by  
24 South Coast Air Quality Management District. So from what  
25 I understood with those comments is they didn't have

1 concerns about this project, the upgrades, and they also  
2 spoke to the credits that would be part of the mitigation.  
3 So as far as South Coast Air Quality Management District  
4 goes, they're not concerned. That was my read. Is that  
5 correct from your perspective?

6 DR. QIAN: Correct.

7 COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: Okay. Thank you, Wenjun.  
8 Does anyone else have questions?

9 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Other questions? Yeah,  
10 Commissioner McAllister.

11 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Thanks so much. I  
12 really appreciate Ashley and Pam. Thanks for the  
13 presentations, and Wenjun, thanks very much.

14 Let's see. I guess maybe following a little bit  
15 on that heat rate discussion, I guess, so this, you know,  
16 we're really focused on, from the presentations and just  
17 the reality here, and given the events that have driven the  
18 reliability reserve discussion and the DEBA allocation of  
19 funds, we're really focused on the peak capacity of, you  
20 know, the sort of hot summer afternoon, you know, capacity  
21 and these upgrades. Most of them, the lion's share,  
22 focused on that. And efficiency is a good thing. You  
23 know, definitely improving heat rate is great.

24 And I guess I'm wondering, and maybe this is for  
25 Frank, the -- so, you know, we're getting some relatively

1 cost-effective additional practical capacity with this  
2 investment. How will these improvements play out the rest  
3 of the year, just during normal operations?

4 Oh, go ahead.

5 MR. MESSINEO: Is the mic working?

6 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: There you go.

7 MR. MESSINEO: Okay. Okay. Frank Messineo,  
8 Burbank Border and Power.

9 The efficiency improvements will be seen  
10 throughout the operating range. So during periods when  
11 we're producing less power or even at minimum output, we  
12 would still see those heat rate improvements.

13 Did I properly adjust your question?

14 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Yeah. I guess maybe  
15 just a little bit beyond that. Is it going to change the  
16 way you, say, dispatch this resource?

17 MR. MESSINEO: I don't believe it will make a  
18 major impact on how it's dispatched. It would be, you  
19 know, it would be available at any time that there's an  
20 emergency or that it's needed. But I see the summer  
21 dispatch may change. Other than that, I think the -- I  
22 don't think the heat rate's going to be a major impact on  
23 how it's dispatched.

24 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Okay. Great. Thanks a  
25 lot.

1 MR. MESSINEO: Thank you.

2 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Really appreciate that.

3 And Ms. Samra, maybe just for you, could you  
4 provide -- I really appreciate the context of reliability  
5 and sort of why this -- you know, the broader portfolio and  
6 how this fits in. Could you give us maybe a little more  
7 color on Burbank's kind of electrification future and load  
8 growth and the like, just in the context of, yeah, we're in  
9 this messy transition where we're trying to figure out  
10 which resources to keep online? And as we furiously build  
11 out the renewables fleet, which I think we've heard from  
12 almost all the commenters that that's their priority, could  
13 you talk about how sort of this fits in with the long-term  
14 planning and positioning that Burbank is doing?

15 MS. SAMRA: Yes. We have a lot of -- Mandip  
16 Samra again -- have a lot of housing needs that we need to  
17 do based on state regulations. So Burbank is looking at  
18 16,000 units of housing over the next two decades. And  
19 with that, we need to make sure that we have the energy to  
20 provide our customers our water, et cetera.

21 One of the other things, too, is our municipal  
22 fleet for Burbank Water and Power is already 70 percent  
23 hybrid or electric. We're moving slowly towards 100  
24 percent. We are looking to have a lot more optionality for  
25 DC fast chargers and more Level 2s. In our parking lot,

1 almost every single spot has a Level 2 charger in one of  
2 our offline parking places. So we are looking at that. We  
3 do have a group that focus on sustainability. We have a  
4 sustainability officer. One of the few utilities that  
5 actually has that is focused entirely on this.

6 So this goes in really good with our EcoCampus  
7 where we test out new technologies. We have a 10-acre  
8 space in the middle of an urban city. We are surrounded by  
9 the 5 Freeway, the Metrolink and Nickelodeon. That's kind  
10 of where we're at. So we do try to maximize the space we  
11 have to test out technologies and we are moving towards  
12 electrification across the board.

13 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Great. Well, thanks a  
14 lot. Thanks again for being here. I appreciate your  
15 input. Thanks.

16 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Thank you.

17 Commissioner Skinner?

18 COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Thank you. I think it's  
19 on. Yeah.

20 I appreciate the staff's presentation, and also  
21 the input from our operator, and of course our public  
22 comments, the concerns that were expressed by a good number  
23 of commentators.

24 I think as some of my colleagues have rightfully  
25 indicated, we are, we meaning we the Commission, in terms

1 of overseeing these types of things and the whole state of  
2 California, we're in a transition phase right now. And we,  
3 as a past legislator, I know well, the legislature has  
4 directed not only our agency, but just the state of  
5 California in general to move to a clean energy future,  
6 meaning a non-fossil fuel, non-emission future.

7 That doesn't happen overnight. We've made  
8 phenomenal progress. We're farther than any state by far.  
9 And we will never just rest on our laurels. We always want  
10 to go further, but we also have to keep the lights on and  
11 do our very best to keep rates affordable. And that's  
12 never easy, especially because we're in the middle of the  
13 changes in the climate, as is evidenced by the terrible  
14 fires we've experienced, the higher heat days, so many  
15 other things.

16 So is it my preference to extend any type of  
17 fossil fuel plant? No. But is it sometimes necessary?  
18 Yes. And the good thing about this particular proposal  
19 before us is that it improves its efficiency. Our action  
20 and our funding actually will give us more units of  
21 electricity for the fossil fuel, for the unit of fossil  
22 fuel burnt than we had before and allow us to utilize it  
23 when our sun is not shining. And perhaps, I mean, we are  
24 expanding batteries significantly, and we will continue to,  
25 but we also need that transition phase.

1           So like I said, it's always times when you have  
2 to make difficult decisions, or rather decisions that you  
3 would just as soon -- you know, I would love to be at the  
4 end of the transition already, and we're not.

5           So the combination of the staff's good report and  
6 all of the things I read on what this particular proposal  
7 is before us puts me in the position of, yes, that this is  
8 the direction that we should go in, even though I would  
9 prefer that we were already at the end of a transition  
10 versus needing to extend some fossil fuel facilities in  
11 order to get to that transition that we're trying to  
12 achieve.

13           CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Commissioner McAllister?

14           COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: I completely agree with  
15 those comments. You know, these are hard decisions. This  
16 one actually isn't as hard as some of them we've made in my  
17 view, because we're not actually extending the life of this  
18 plan; right? We're not. I think as we heard, this is --  
19 the lifetime of the plan is the same and we're sort of  
20 squeezing more out, more efficiency of an investment that  
21 the bulk, the vast majority of which has already been made.  
22 And so this is an incremental improvement to get some  
23 relatively affordable capacity over that same lifetime. So  
24 I guess I just wanted to make sure that to point that out.

25           These are hard, you know, these are hard choices,

1 and absolutely we need to figure out ways to stop using  
2 fossil molecules and combusting in air basins across the  
3 state. And over the long term, we're doing that. We've  
4 actually made amazing progress. And with this, just given  
5 the context of electrification and load growth and  
6 reliability challenges and the impacts of climate change  
7 that we're living, seems like a relatively prudent way to  
8 address this near and medium term challenge.

9 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Yeah, please, Commissioner  
10 Skinner.

11 COMMISSIONER SKINNER: And as the implication of  
12 that improved efficiency, as our colleague Commissioner  
13 Gallardo pointed out, and particularly in asking her  
14 questions, is that it is going to be less polluting. So  
15 there will be less emissions for the amount of fossil fuel  
16 that is burned in this plant. And that's, of course,  
17 always a huge improvement.

18 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: I'll share my comments last.  
19 So do either of you want to make a comment?

20 Yeah, please, Commissioner -- Vice Chair.

21 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Thank you, Chair.

22 And thank you, Commissioner Skinner and  
23 McAllister for your comments. I think I, you know,  
24 personally kind of, you know, also feel very similarly  
25 about the comments that you made. But I think prior to,

1 and I think just stating how we move forward in the  
2 transition, I think it's really important to acknowledge  
3 two things.

4           One, I want to just thank all the staff, Pam,  
5 specifically to you and the staff team on doing all the  
6 work you need to bring this to the Commission for a vote  
7 today, and being thoughtful and, you know, as careful as  
8 possible in your analysis. So I just want to say thank  
9 you. Ashley, thank you for your presentation. Wenjun,  
10 thank you for your comments today. So I think, you know,  
11 just kind of 30,000-foot level, I want to just start with  
12 thanks to the staff.

13           It's also, as Commissioner Skinner pointed out,  
14 it's a really hard balance as we move towards this  
15 transition. You know, we're in point A. You know, point  
16 B, I think most of us are absolutely aligned. We want to  
17 have a clean, reliable and affordable system that is  
18 equitable and, you know, not repeat the mistakes of the  
19 past. I think we're all aligned on that. And we're in  
20 this moment of transition. And this moment of transition  
21 requires a lot of choices that do not seem optimal.

22           So with that, I also want to note that for all  
23 the efforts that Burbank's doing, SCPPA, and CPA, trying to  
24 kind of make sure that there is reliable power to your  
25 customers, I recognize as we make these votes that many of

1 our choices impact communities in the end. And it's really  
2 important for us to acknowledge the comments that were made  
3 by many of the community members, but also concerned  
4 citizens on, you know, not seeing this as the ideal path  
5 and kind of making, you know, sharing that the  
6 disappointment in the choices, you know, that are in front  
7 of us.

8           So I want to acknowledge that as an important  
9 part of two things.

10           One, please don't stop pushing back, because it's  
11 really important. Even when we make these choices, the way  
12 we make those choices or the next choice will be influenced  
13 by the comments you all make. So I just want to say thank  
14 you for making those comments.

15           And second, I would like to have the opportunity  
16 to submit some of the, you know, core issues that might not  
17 be very obvious from the top. So I want to just share a  
18 few things that we had to go through since 2020.

19           The first thing is, whether it's 2020 or 2022,  
20 when we had this incredible, you know, tightness on the  
21 grid, the one thing that we did was throw everything at the  
22 table to keep the lights on. That meant, you know,  
23 basically turning on every backup generator in the state,  
24 diesel backup generators, unhooking large marine vessels  
25 from the shore power and running them on bunker fuel.

1           And we did everything, including what is in front  
2 of us today, which is, there's a process called the 202(c)  
3 DOE waiver process. When we don't have enough power on the  
4 system, we go to DOE and request a 202(c) waiver to run  
5 these power plants at the nameplate capacity, even if it  
6 means they are, you know, exceeding the permit levels. And  
7 so this effort, specifically as the legislature was  
8 thinking through, the improvements of the efficiency was to  
9 really kind of have that maximal power available without  
10 exceeding the emissions that are permitted in those basins.  
11 So it was an important part of the legislature's effort as  
12 we thought about the totality of the issue.

13           So when we came out of the 2020 and 2022 crisis,  
14 there were a few things that were observed.

15           One, we were not procuring enough at a bulk  
16 level. Two, even to the extent that we were procuring, we  
17 were not building. Three, even if we are building, we are  
18 not planning for extreme events enough. So those were the  
19 three things that were in front of the legislature to  
20 figure out how best to structure a long-term transition  
21 plan.

22           And what that resulted in is extraordinary  
23 procurement from PUC, but extraordinary procurement of  
24 POUs, and having this over 30,000 megawatts of clean energy  
25 resources that were added in the last six years to the

1 grid. That's a fact. You know, that's a good thing that  
2 happened.

3           Second, we've done a lot of permitting reform to  
4 ensure that we are able to build if we procure. So there  
5 has been procurement, there has been build-out, and  
6 ensuring that the interconnection process at CAISO, but  
7 also the permitting process has been, you know, reformed to  
8 ensure that we can build quickly.

9           And finally, this is the third part, as we move  
10 from point A to point B, we are not going to do it in a way  
11 that we have enough energy on the system in the near term.  
12 As Deana pointed out, and much of the staff analysis in CEC  
13 points to, if we have coincidental events, even today, we  
14 are really vulnerable to those extreme events. And every  
15 megawatt means something during those days when the grid is  
16 really stressed.

17           So from that perspective, when the legislature  
18 looked at how best to fund this, they did four things.

19           One, the legislature extended the -- or gave the  
20 permissive language to extend the operations at Diablo  
21 Canyon to 2030. The legislature put about a billion  
22 dollars in what is called SREP (phonetic) funding, that was  
23 for clean energy acceleration of resources. Three, the  
24 DEBA Program. And then four, the DSGS program. All of  
25 them were a part of the overall strategy. And within the

1 DEBA context, the statute specifically offers that we need  
2 to fund efficiency projects.

3           So I just want to say that this falls within the  
4 context of the broader transition. And while it is  
5 disappointing to many, you know, as Commissioner Skinner  
6 said, it's not preferred for any of us to continue the  
7 operations of the fossil fleet, but it is a necessary thing  
8 to ensure reliability and affordability at the moment. And  
9 I would be the first to acknowledge that oftentimes these  
10 projects impact communities and that's something that we  
11 need to get better at.

12           In closing, I want to say, you know, I was  
13 surprised to get the Sierra Club letter on Monday of last  
14 week, which was very late into the process. I commend  
15 Commissioner Gallardo, the staff, and the Executive Office  
16 for extending the vote on this item so to make sure that  
17 we're all talking together. But I request our staff to  
18 think about ways to make sure we're hearing from the  
19 communities of concern here sooner than later.

20           So with all that, I'm proud of the staff for all  
21 the good work you all do and looking forward to supporting  
22 this item.

23           CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Thank you.

24           Commissioner Gallardo?

25           COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: Buenas tardes. Good

1 afternoon. My mom would be so upset that I just jumped  
2 into questions and didn't really greet you properly.

3           So I just want to say I'm also grateful to Vice  
4 Chair Gunda for laying out that very complex situation that  
5 we're in and being able to amplify why we have to make  
6 tough decisions and why we're in these positions. So it's  
7 a privilege to be in this position. At the same time, it  
8 comes with a lot of responsibility. And as you heard, we  
9 take it very seriously.

10           I also wanted to say I'm very grateful to  
11 everyone joining today. We did extend this meeting, so  
12 some people had to take more steps than others, especially  
13 the public. We had over a dozen commenters today,  
14 including the Sierra Club, Pasadena 100, Third Act, the  
15 Citizens Climate Lobby, and some that I missed. But as,  
16 also, Vice Chair Gunda said, we're very grateful. Even  
17 when there's pushback and challenge on us, that makes us do  
18 better. And so we need to be reminded of that. And again,  
19 we take that seriously as well.

20           I also want to appreciate my fellow Commissioners  
21 who came in today who weren't planning on it. And we're  
22 just -- you know, that's how seriously we take it. We're  
23 willing to do that extra step.

24           And also to the support staff who set everything  
25 up, I want to give you special acknowledgement for doing

1 that.

2 And I also want to thank our Division staff.  
3 There was extra coordination that had to be done, because  
4 it wasn't just a single division, it was both our STEP and  
5 RREDI Divisions. And it's already difficult enough to do a  
6 single item, let alone coordinate, but you did a  
7 magnificent job helping everybody understand how the two  
8 come together.

9 And I want to offer my apologies to Dr. Qian. We  
10 were calling her Wenjun, and she does have her Ph.D. So my  
11 apologies on behalf of all of us for making that mistake.

12 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: It's informal.

13 COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: I know it is. That's why  
14 we're informal. It's fondness.

15 I also wanted to thank the multiple local  
16 authorities who came out here in person, took that time.  
17 And you know, that's resources that you're spending, so  
18 appreciate that you made that investment. South Coast Air  
19 Quality Management District didn't make it, but they  
20 submitted the statement, which I thought was really  
21 helpful, Burbank Water and Power, and also Southern  
22 California Public Power Authority.

23 And then I want to acknowledge some of the  
24 concerns raised that approving these two items seem  
25 counterintuitive to the Energy Commission's clean energy

1 transition goals, since we are approving a fossil fuel  
2 facility on upgrades, not expansion or an increase of  
3 capacity, but it still will result in the emissions that  
4 Dr. Chan explained to us.

5 But what I focus on, too, is that we're going to  
6 need this type of efficiency when folks need it most, not  
7 just to keep the lights on, but to keep people alive. So  
8 those are the things that we have to balance as well. Some  
9 people need the energy all the time. Otherwise, they lose  
10 a lot and they're really harmed.

11 And then I want to end by saying that I don't  
12 forget our mission to get to a 100 percent clean energy  
13 future. I am in charge of the Opt-In Certification  
14 Program, which is one of the ways that we're trying to get  
15 more clean energy generation. Somebody called it more  
16 reliable renewables, so that is the purpose there, and more  
17 energy storage systems as well. So we're working really  
18 hard on that. I'm committed to making sure those projects  
19 come through as long as they're going to be safe for our  
20 communities.

21 So all of that to say that this interim step is  
22 necessary. I am aligned with staff's recommendation to  
23 approve these two agenda items.

24 Thank you, Chair.

25 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Great. Well, thank you all.

1 Thanks to my colleagues. Thanks to members of the public  
2 for providing all those comments and input.

3           So just a few thoughts from myself. I've spent  
4 most of my career working on decarbonizing the electric  
5 grid in California. And I wanted to say, the way I think  
6 about this is that this kind of upgrade and efficiency  
7 improvement is really in a different category than new  
8 fossil fuel infrastructure. It's really about taking  
9 something that has to continue for a period of time and  
10 making it as efficient as it can be.

11           And what I wanted to relay is that we are  
12 actually making incredible progress on decarbonizing the  
13 grid as a whole. So in 2025, for the first time in the  
14 history of our state, we're hitting 100 percent clean  
15 energy on the CAISO system, 9 out of every 10 days, okay,  
16 234 out of the last 274 days in California. It's never  
17 happened before. And this is for a period of the day. I  
18 mean, July, we averaged almost seven hours at 100 percent  
19 clean. So the problem that we're trying to solve for is  
20 actually getting smaller. And we're about 70 percent of  
21 the electricity on the grid today coming from clean  
22 sources.

23           You know, one way to think about it, since  
24 electricity came to the state of California in 1850 in San  
25 Francisco, roughly 175 years ago, we've added 105 gigs of

1 capacity. Almost 32 gigs have come online since Gavin  
2 Newsom was elected governor in 2019. And that's virtually  
3 all clean, and including 17 gigs of energy storage. So  
4 this is both helping the grid be cleaner, because then you  
5 can run, you know, solar power at night or wind when it's  
6 not -- when the wind's not blowing, and have storage  
7 dispatch when we need it. And it's making the grid more  
8 reliable, as well as decarbonizing.

9 We're going to continue aggressively on that  
10 journey. And we, outside of China, California is leading  
11 the world on energy storage. And, you know, we look at our  
12 siting queue, it's about 20 gigs in the queue, it's 98  
13 percent solar in storage. So that's what's coming.

14 So for those reasons, I do support this  
15 efficiency upgrade as a piece of the puzzle as we work to  
16 aggressively decarbonize our grid. And I want to just  
17 thank, again, all the staff for all the diligence, and to  
18 my colleagues, especially the Vice Chair and Commissioner  
19 Gallardo.

20 And with that, I would welcome a motion. We're  
21 going to do these in sequence. So I'd welcome motion first  
22 on Item 2 from the Vice Chair.

23 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Move Item 2.

24 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Moved by the Vice Chair.

25 Is there a second by Commissioner McAllister?

1 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Second Item 2.  
2 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: All in favor, say aye.  
3 Vice Chair Gunda?  
4 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Aye.  
5 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Commissioner McAllister?  
6 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Aye.  
7 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Commissioner Gallardo?  
8 COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: Aye.  
9 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Commissioner Skinner?  
10 COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Aye.  
11 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: And I vote aye as well. Item  
12 2 passes unanimously.  
13 We'll turn now to Item 3. Is there a motion from  
14 the Vice Chair?  
15 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Move Item 3.  
16 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Is there a second from  
17 Commissioner Gallardo?  
18 COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: I second.  
19 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: All in favor, say aye.  
20 Vice Chair Gunda?  
21 VICE CHAIR GUNDA: Aye.  
22 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Commissioner Gallardo?  
23 COMMISSIONER GALLARDO: Aye.  
24 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Commissioner McAllister?  
25 COMMISSIONER MCALLISTER: Aye.

1 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Commissioner Skinner?

2 COMMISSIONER SKINNER: Aye.

3 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: And I vote aye as well. Item  
4 3 passes unanimously. Thank you, everyone.

5 And finally, we'll turn now to Item 4, Chief  
6 Counsel's Report.

7 MR. RANCHOD: No report today, Chair.

8 CHAIR HOCHSCHILD: Okay, with that, we're  
9 adjourned. Thanks, everyone.

10 (The meeting adjourned at 3:39 p.m.)

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

## CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 25th day of February, 2026.



---

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT\*\*367

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.



MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT\*\*367

February 25, 2026